<center>**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</center>

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2007.

**I.    Summary of the Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2007, claims 1, 3-8, 10, 29-35, and 37-45 were pending in the Application.  In the Office Action, claims 30-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.  Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8, 10, 29-30, 32, 34-35, 37-39, 41, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereinafter Park).  Claims 4, 6, 31, 33, 40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park, in view of Official Notice.

.

**II.    Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Reply amends claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8, 29-35, 37-39, 41, and 43-44, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 3-8, 10, 29-35, and 37-45.  Reconsideration of the claims in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested.  Applicants reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

**III.    Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 30-35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.  These claims have been amended to require a "computer readable medium" to properly depend from computer readable medium claim 29.  Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30-35 and 37 now properly conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**IV.    Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8, 10, 29-30, 32, 34-35, 37-39, 41, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereinafter Park).

<center>- 8 -</center>

Claim 1 defines:

1. (Currently amended) A method of searching a plurality of service provider content repositories, comprising:

providing for the representation of the plurality of service provider content repositories as a virtual content repository (VCR) that includes a content model, the content model including a set of content nodes and a set of hierarchy of nodes such that a content node is created for each of the plurality of service provider content repositories, each content node identifies a service provider content repository, and each content node is associated with its own content schema, a hierarchy node is created for different types of content available in the plurality of service provider content repositories, each hierarchy node is associated with one or more content nodes in the set of content nodes, and each hierarchy node is associated with its own hierarchy schema;

wherein each one of the plurality of service provider content repositories implements a service provider interface (SPI) that integrates each of the corresponding service provider content repositories as virtual components into the VCR and such that each SPI interfaces between the VCR and the corresponding service provider content repository;

searching the VCR for information that satisfies a search expression, including searching over each of the virtual components and the service provider content repositories associated therewith; and

providing search results.

Claim 1 as amended defines providing for the representation of the plurality of service provider content repositories as a virtual content repository (VCR). The VCR includes a content model, the content model including a set of content nodes and a set of hierarchy nodes. A content node is created for each of the plurality of service provider content repositories, and each content node identifies a service provider content repository. A hierarchy node is associated with one or more content nodes in the set of content nodes. An SPI integrates each of the corresponding service provider content repositories as virtual components into the VCR and such that each SPI interfaces between the VCR and the corresponding service provider content repository. Searching the VCR for information that satisfies a search expression includes searching over each of the virtual components and the service provider content repositories associated therewith.

Park discloses a content publication system for supporting real-time integration and processing of multimedia content including dynamic data. A repository 8, that includes content repository 70, may store data produced by a service producer in advance and data brought from various data sources in real time. Data can be images, audio, video, or multimedia data. (para.

- 9 -

Atty. Docket No.: BEAS-01365US0 KFK/JDM
jmissud/beas/1365us0/Response to OA dated 3-13-07

0032). The content repository 70 is capable of integrating a plurality of static and dynamic content, in units of containers 74

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define providing for the *representation* of the plurality of *service provider* content repositories as a virtual content repository (VCR). The VCR 100 is separate from the plurality of service provider content repositories 108. (Fig. 1). Park discloses storing data from service providers into a content repository. The content repository for storing data from service providers as disclosed in Park, however, is not the same as providing for the representation of service provider content repositories, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that the SPI integrates each of the corresponding service provider content repositories *as virtual components* into the VCR. Again, these content repositories are separate from the VCR, and are instead virtual components of the VCR. Park discloses that the content producer can use the content manipulation API 51 in the service publication server. The content manipulation API 51 checks whether the container 74 to be manipulated exists in a memory of the service publication server. Otherwise, the container 74 is fetched from the content repository 70. (para. 0069). The API for manipulating containers stored in memory or the content repository 70, as disclosed in Park, is not the same as an SPI that integrates content repositories as virtual components in the VCR, as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 requires a content model that includes a set of content nodes and a set of hierarchy nodes, both of which have their own schemas. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that each content node *identifies a service provider content repository*. The hierarchy nodes are associated with one or more content nodes. The content model is thus part of the VCR used to represent the service provider content repositories. Park discloses a container document object model (DOM) object 55. The DOM object converts the container from the repository into XML format. (para. 0059). An object that converts a container into XML format is not the same as a content model that includes a set of content nodes and a set of hierarchy nodes, as required by claim 1.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Park fails to teach or suggest providing for the representation of the plurality of service provider content repositories as a virtual content repository (VCR) that includes a content model, the content model including a set of content nodes and a set of hierarchy of nodes such that a content node is created for each of the plurality of service provider content repositories, each content node identifies a service provider content repository, a hierarchy node is associated with one or more content nodes in the set of content nodes; wherein each one of the plurality of service provider content repositories

- 10 -

implements a service provider interface (SPI) that integrates each of the corresponding service provider content repositories as virtual components into the VCR and such that each SPI interfaces between the VCR and the corresponding service provider content repository; and searching the VCR for information that satisfies a search expression, including searching over each of the virtual components and the service provider content repositories associated therewith, as required by claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Park, and respectfully request reconsideration of the claim.

Claims 29 and 38

The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 29 and 38 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments of the invention therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 29 and 38 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Park, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 34, and 43

As amended, claims 7, 34, and 43 require extending the content model to store information about the content model in the plurality of service provider content repositories. As discussed above for claim 1, the content nodes and hierarchy nodes, which each have their own schemas, are part of the content model. These nodes are separate from the plurality of service provider content repositories. Park discloses that each container is identified by a directory path 160 in a repository storing the container and its author name. The directory path and author name stored in the same content repository as the container as disclosed in Park is not the same as storing content model information into the separate plurality of service provider content repositories, as required by claims 7, 34, and 43. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 34, and 43 are neither anticipate by, nor obvious in view of Park, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 37, and 45

Claims 10, 37, and 45 require searching one or more of the content nodes, the content node schemas, the hierarchy nodes, and the hierarchy node schemas. As discussed above for claim 1, the content nodes and hierarchy nodes, which each have their own schemas, are part of the content model. These nodes are separate from the plurality of service provider content

- 11 -

repositories. Park discloses an integrate search service for integrating data from various data sources and allowing for search based on search conditions. The various sources of 1b are included in services 1a-1e that can be published by the service publication server 4. (para. 0035). Searching for data from these services is not the same as searching for data in a content model, a model that represents such services. Thus, Park does not disclose searching one or more of the content nodes, the content node schemas, the hierarchy nodes, and the hierarchy node schemas, as required by claims 10, 37, and 45. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7, 34, and 43 are neither anticipate by, nor obvious in view of Park, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 30, 32, 35, 39, 41, and 44

Claims 3, 5, 8, 30, 32, 35, 39, 41, and 44 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.


**V.    Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 4, 6, 31, 33, 40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park, in view of Official Notice.


Claims 4, 6, 31, 33, 40, and 42

Claims 4, 6, 31, 33, 40, and 42 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

- 12 -

**VIII. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if she can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the time to respond up to and including August 13, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,


Date: __August 13, 2007____     By:   __/Julie Daniels Missud/_____
                                       Julie Daniels Missud
                                       Reg. No. 51,330


FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910

- 13 -